

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 have been amended and claims 12-21 have been added. Claims 1 and 12 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright et al., USPN 5,051,898. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Cariffe et al., USPN 6,201,548. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Hernandez et al., USPN 4,686,522. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area on a computer display. Independent claim 1 exemplifies the method of the present invention and recites a combination of steps including "displaying an existing network in said working area" and "displaying an extended network where an additional object of the type that is indicated in association with the selected subarea is inserted into the selected subarea."

The method of the present invention is illustrated most clearly by Figs. 4a and 4b of the present invention. Specifically, an existing network 20 is illustrated in Fig. 4a, while an extended network 20' is illustrated in Fig. 4b. Applicants respectfully submit that the

references relied on by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Referring to the Wright et al. reference, this reference describes a system for creating a computer tool from a predefined tool template. According to one embodiment of Wright et al., the template has a plurality of graphical constituents, allowing the user to specify data and parameters (see Abstract).

Applicants submit that this is quite different from the present invention, which rather provides a computer system designed to aid a designer of a logical network. In terms of Wright et al., this would correspond to the tool template itself, which defines the flow of the data in a computer tool. The process of designing a logical network is more dynamic than the process of "filling in the blanks" of a predefined tool template as described by Wright et al. As consequence, the method of the present invention is entirely different from the teachings of Wright et al.

Referring to column 1, line 62 through column 2, line 6, it is clearly described in Wright et al. that the tool template is used to allow the user to control the program as it executes. The tool template allows a user to control execution of the program and to observe execution of the program. Referring to Fig. 2 of Wright et al., the tool template is illustrated. During execution of the program, the user is able to control the program in order to select data and parameters to invoke the program. In view of this, the tool template is

not extended during the execution of the program, but only the contents of the tool template are modified.

In the present invention, however, both an existing network and an extended network are displayed. It would be necessary for Wright et al. to extend the tool template, not just select a parameter for the tool template in order to meet these aspects of the present invention.

It should also be noted that a process that corresponds to the process described by Wright et al., e.g., including selecting parameter values and function characteristics, takes place *after* the logical network is completed. In the presently claimed invention; however, an existing network is extended to include an additional object inserted into a selected subarea. Applicants submit that the Wright et al. reference fails to disclose the above aspects of the present invention and therefore fails to anticipate independent claim 1 of the present invention.

With regard to dependent claims 2-11, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon allowable independent claim 1, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on the Cariffe et al. reference and the Hernandez et al. reference, these references have been relied on to disclose graphically outlining a subarea and changing the appearance of a cursor, respectively. There is no disclosure in either of the Cariffe et al. or Hernandez et al. references of "displaying an

extended network where an additional object of the type that is indicated in association with the selected subarea is inserted into the selected subarea" as recited in independent claim 1 of the present invention. Accordingly, these references fail to make up for the deficiencies of Wright et al.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 12-21 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12, which is directed to an apparatus for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area on a computer display, defines the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner for the same reasons mentioned above with regard to independent claim 1.

With regard to dependent claims 13-21, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon independent claim 12, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 12-21 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By



James M. Slattery, #28,380

for #43,368
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS/PCL/cl
0104-0345P